

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 and 18-26 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 15, 19 and 22-24 have been amended. Claim 18 has been cancelled. Claims 1-15 and 19-26 are pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 102(e) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the PG-Publication to Wilson et al. (hereinafter “Wilson”).

Applicants have canceled claim 18, and have amended claim 15 to include the limitations of storing digital data points of the digital signal in the receiver; and transmitting a batch of the stored digital data points of the digital signal from the receiver to the collection device. Wilson does not teach storing multiple digital data points in the seismic receiver. Nor does Wilson teach a batch transfer of stored digital data points from the seismic receiver to a collection device. Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 15 is not anticipated by Wilson.

Section 103(a) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 9, 19, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orban et al. (WO 98/12577) (hereinafter “Orban”) or Fort (U.S. Patent 4,320,472)) (hereinafter, “Fort”) when taking in view of Onyia et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0169559) (hereinafter “Onyia”), claims 2-8, 10-14, 20, 21 and 24-26 as being unpatentable over Orban or Fort as applied to claims 1, 9, 19, 22 and 23 above, and further in view of Wilson.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite limitations that the receiver is configured to store the digital data points, and a digital signal transmission circuitry, coupled to the

analog to digital converter, that transmits a batch of the stored digital data points to the data recorder. None of Orban, Fort or Onyia, either singly or in combination, teach or suggest storing multiple digital data points in the seismic receiver. Nor does the cited art teach or suggest a batch transfer of stored digital data points from the seismic receiver to the data recorder. Independent claims 9, 19, 22 and 23 have been similarly amended.

Claim 24 has been amended to recite a limitation of test circuitry that transmits test signals to separately test the seismic energy detector, the analog to digital converter and the digital signal transmission circuitry, wherein a response from the seismic energy detector to one or more of the test signals is used to determine a compensation factor for an orientation of the seismic receiver relative to the perpendicular. While Orban teaches a test signal generator (FIG. 2, column 4, lines 24-30), Orban does not teach the test signal generator generating test signals for a seismic energy detector, or using a response from the seismic energy detector to determine a compensation factor for an orientation of the seismic receiver to the perpendicular. In fact, Orban teaches that the test signals can be fed either to the ADC via a multiplexor, or via the multiplexor to the feed-back control module (Column 4, lines 27-30), not to the seismic sensor. Orban mentions nothing of using the test response to determine a compensation factor. Neither Orban, Onyia, Fort, nor Wilson, singly or in combination, teach or suggest the combination of limitations in amended claim 24.

For at least the reasons cited above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of independent claims 1, 9, 9, 15, 19, 22, 23 and 24 is clearly not supported by the teachings of Orban, Onyia, Fort and Wilson, and removal of the 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested.

Applicants also assert that the rejection of numerous ones of the dependent claims is further unsupported by the teachings of the cited art. However, since the rejection of the independent claims has been shown to have been overcome, a further discussion of the rejection of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5932-00100/RCK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- Return Receipt Postcard
- Petition for Extension of Time
- Notice of Change of Address
- Fee Authorization Form authorizing a deposit account debit in the amount of \$ for fees ().
- Other:

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Kowert
Reg. No. 39,255
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: February 4, 2005